

REMARKS

Re-examination and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed on January 5, 2005, the Examiner rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,594,633 to BROERMAN in view of an article by STEPHEN et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection.

According to a feature of the present invention, a prospective purchaser is able to move, within a displayed housing, a viewpoint from which the interior of the housing is seen, so as to have a view as if the prospective purchaser is moving in the interior of the housing. Applicant submits that at least this feature is neither disclosed or suggested by the applied art of record, either singularly or in combination.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner asserts that BROERMAN discloses most of the features of Applicant's claimed invention but that STEPHEN et al. discloses what is lacking in BROERMAN. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. For example, BROERMAN fails to disclose/suggest a three-dimensional display of the interior of a housing, and STEPHEN et al. only shows a three-dimensional display of an outer appearance of a housing. Thus, Applicant submits that the combination suggested by the Examiner fails to disclose or suggest the showing of a three-dimensional display of the interior of the housing.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that the change of a viewpoint in BROERMAN is effective with respect to changing or selecting the subject or category of character data to be displayed, but does not move the viewpoint from which an image of the interior of the housing is seen. Accordingly, even if one attempted to combine the applied art of record in

the manner suggested by the Examiner, Applicant submits that one would fail to arrive at the presently claimed invention, as such a combination would lack at least the above-discussed feature of Applicant's claimed invention.

By the current amendment, Applicant amends the independent claims to clarify that a second display performing section enables the prospective purchaser to move, within the displayed housing, a viewpoint from which the interior of the housing is seen, providing a view as if the prospective purchaser is moving in the interior of the housing. At least this feature is lacking from the prior art combination set forth by the Examiner. In view of the present amendment, Applicant submits that the present invention, as defined by the claims, is distinguishable from the applied art of record.

Applicant also submits an Information Disclosure Statement for the Examiner's consideration, in which a German Office Action (and references cited therein) is submitted for the Examiner's consideration. Applicant submits that the documents noted in the German Office Action fail to teach or suggest the present invention, as defined by the amended claims. However, as the Office Action mailed in this application was made final, Applicant has filed the present Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in order to obtain the Examiner's consideration of these documents.

Lastly, Applicant notes that the Examiner has not considered the relevancy of previously submitted Korean Unexamined Patent Publication No. 1999-68557, and Japanese Patent No. 3061933, on the ground that the documents are not in English. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position. Applicant submits that the relevancy of the Korean Unexamined Patent Publication was discussed in the Korean Office Action that accompanied the prior submission of the Korean document for the

Examiner's consideration, and thus, the Examiner must consider the relevancy of the Korean document, at least to the extent it is discussed in the Korean Office Action. Applicant notes that submission of a foreign Office Action complies with the Patent Office's requirement to provide an explanation of the relevancy of a foreign language document.

Applicant further notes that the relevancy of Japanese Patent No. 3061933 is discussed with respect to an International Search Report in counterpart application PCT/JP00/07731, a copy of which was submitted to the Examiner in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 28, 2001.


Accordingly, as the relevancy of both documents is discussed in communications issued by foreign patent offices, Applicant submits that the U.S. Examiner must consider the relevancy of these documents with respect to the claims in the pending application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to confirm his consideration of these documents in the next official communication. Applicant is enclosing a copy of a PTO-1499 Form for this purpose.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the present invention as now defined by the pending claims, and in further view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested and is believed to be appropriate.

If there should be any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Kayo IMAMURA



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Steven Wegman
Reg. No. 31,438

April 4, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Enclosure: PTO-1499 Form (for completion by Examiner)